

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

1. Rejection of claims 1, 8, and 10 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b):

Claims 1, 8, and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Cucchi (US 4,899,352).

5

Response:

Claims 1, 8, and 10 have been amended to overcome these rejections. Claim 1 has been amended to include limitations previously contained in the original claim 2. Notably, claim 1 now specifies that the write blocking logic comprises
10 “a write select counter electrically connected to the write counter for counting how many data the configurable write buffer has ever stored” and “a read select counter electrically connected to the read counter for counting how many data the configurable write buffer has ever transferred to the single port memory unit”. Additionally, claim 1 now specifies that the configurable write buffer comprises
15 “a demultiplexer for storing data to the configurable write buffer according to the write select counter” and “a multiplexer for transferring data stored in the configurable write buffer to the single port memory unit according to the read select counter”.

20 In contrast, Cucchi does not teach that the write blocking logic comprises a write select counter or a read select counter that count how many data the configurable write buffer has ever stored or transferred, respectively. Cucchi also does not teach that the configurable write buffer comprises “a demultiplexer for storing data to the configurable write buffer according to the write select counter”
25 or “a multiplexer for transferring data stored in the configurable write buffer to the single port memory unit according to the read select counter”. Thus, the amended claim 1 should be allowable over the cited prior art.

Similarly, claim 8 has been amended to add limitations previously contained
30 in claim 9, and now specifies that the write blocking logic comprises “a write

select counter” and “a read select counter” and that the configurable write buffer comprises “a demultiplexer” and “a multiplexer”. As noted above, Cucchi does not teach these limitations, and claim 8 should be patentable over the cited prior art.

5

Claim 10, like claim 8, has been amended to include limitations previously contained in claim 9, and now specifies that the write blocking logic comprises “a write select counter” and “a read select counter” and that the configurable write buffer comprises “a demultiplexer” and “a multiplexer”. Since Cucchi does not teach these limitations, claim 10 should be patentable over the cited prior art.

10

For the reasons given above, the applicant submits that claims 1, 8, and 10 are now in allowable form. Reconsideration of claims 1, 8, and 10 is therefore respectfully requested.

15

2. Introduction to new claim 11:

New claim 11 is a substantial duplicate of the currently amended claim 9, and no new limitations are added. Consideration of claim 11 is respectfully requested.

20

As all pending claims are now in allowable form, the applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

25

30

Appl. No. 10/711,738
Amdt. dated May 24, 2007
Reply to Office action of January 30, 2007

Sincerely yours,



Date: 05/24/2007

5 Winston Hsu, Patent Agent No. 41,526
P.O. BOX 506, Merrifield, VA 22116, U.S.A.
Voice Mail: 302-729-1562
Facsimile: 806-498-6673
e-mail : winstonhsu@naipo.com

10

Note: Please leave a message in my voice mail if you need to talk to me. (The time in D.C. is 12 hours behind the Taiwan time, i.e. 9 AM in D.C. = 9 PM in Taiwan.)